

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

According to the Office Action, claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) for allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5, 693,876 issued to Ghitea, Jr. et al. and U.S. Patent No. 4,180,860 issued to Driscoll et al. For the following reasons, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

The claimed invention relates to a process for visual display of information in motor vehicles. Because of safety reasons, the focus of the vehicle's driver should be on the road, rather at information being displayed for the driver. Therefore, an aim of the claimed invention is to provide graphical representation of comparative information so that the driver can easily ascertain the information with ease and without needing to take his/her eyes off the road for a relatively long time.

To achieve this aim, claims 1-8 provide a display process where interrelated information are displayed as a comparison by graphical representation at the same place alternating with the same type of graphics. For example, the bar-type graphics displaying comparative and interrelated information (Tank v. Range in Figure 1, Range v. Distance in Figure 2, and Average Fuel Consumption v. Current Fuel Consumption in Figure 3) can be easily ascertained by a driver without needing to take his/her eyes off the road for a relatively long time. This feature is very advantageous for safety reasons.

Such feature is neither described nor suggested by the Ghitea Patent along or in combination with the Driscoll Patent. The Ghitea Patent displays multiple information in numerical representation, not graphical representation (See Figure 7). Such numerical representation of multiple information is more difficult to ascertain by a driver, and therefore more dangerous.

Furthermore, there is no suggestion or motivation for combining the teachings of the Ghitea Patent with the Driscoll Patent. The Driscoll Patent

describes a display system for industrial process control instrumentation, not motor vehicles. In fact, there is no mention in the Driscoll Patent of extending the application of its display system to motor vehicles. Since suggestion or motivation to combine reference is a requirement for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), it is respectfully submitted that this rejection is not warranted.

Conclusion

In view of the amendments and remarks made above, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully solicited.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, please charge any such fee or any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayment of fees to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket 080437.49289US).

Respectfully submitted,

CROWELL & MORING LLP

Dated: January 23, 2004

By *George L. Fountain*
GEORGE L. FOUNTAIN
Reg. No. 36,374
Tel.: (949) 263-8400 (Pacific Coast)

Intellectual Property Group
P.O. Box 14300
Washington, D.C. 20004-2595

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/TRANSMISSION (37 CFR 1.8A)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is, on the date shown below, being:

MAILING

FACSIMILE

☒ deposited with the United States Postal Service
as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:
Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450,
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

☐ transmitted by facsimile to the Patent and
Trademark Office.

MM/DD/YYYY

Laura R. Dixon 01/23/2004
Laura R. Dixon Date

Date